

BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT

CONFERENCE REPORT

DATE OF CONFERENCES: February 1 and 8, 2007

LOCATION OF CONFERENCES: J.O. Morton Building

ATTENDED BY: Den Danna, Bill Hauser, Nadine Peterson, Charles Hood, Christine Perron, Bob Landry, Dave Powelson, Darrel Elliott, and Phil Miles, NHDOT; Jim Garvin, Linda Wilson, Edna Feighner, Emily Paulus, and Jim McConaha, Don Lyford, NHDHR; Carol Barleon, Office of Planning and Energy Programming; Dick Verville, Emergency Management; Bill O'Donnell and Leigh Lavine, FHWA; Jason Gallant, Louis Berger; Sandy Logan, Deerfield; Bill Barry, VHB; Jay Poulin, HEB Engineering; and Carl Quiram and Megan Theriault, Town of Goffstown.

SUBJECT: Monthly SHPO-FHWA-ACOE-NHDOT Cultural Resources Meeting

Thursday, February 1

Salem Municipal Projects (no project numbers). Participants: Jason Gallant, Louis Berger Group (jgallant@louisberger.com).

Emerson Way over Widow Harris Brook Bridge (114/108)

Jason Gallant began the discussion with an overview of the bridge's history. The existing bridge was built in 1935, and spans over Widow Harris Brook. It is a cast-in-place concrete slab bridge supported on gravity abutments of dry-laid rubble. Jason Gallant explained that the bridge is on the Municipal Red List due to poor condition of its substructure. At present, due to flood damage, the bridge is limited to one-way traffic by precast barriers at each curb line with an alternating stop condition at each approach. Given its advanced state of deterioration and functional obsolescence, the bridge is scheduled for full replacement under the Municipally Managed Bridge Aid Program. Hydraulic constraints at the site and impacts to downstream structures within the watershed drive the design of this structure. The present preferred alternative is a 14-foot span consisting of a pre-engineered precast concrete rigid frame with precast wing walls. This is recommended as the best blend of structural and hydraulic efficiency, minimal environmental impacts, and economy. This project is mostly in the right-of-way and travels through a marshy area. Because of these factors, the area appears to lack archaeological sensitivity. The project is also not adjacent to a potentially eligible building.

Pelham Road, Pelham Road over Porcupine Brook

The age of the existing 36-inch diameter corrugated metal pipe (CMP) at the Pelham Road crossing is unknown. There are headwalls at the upstream and downstream ends, consisting of a combination of mortared and dry-laid fieldstone and granite slabs. The structure is under approximately two feet of roadway fill.

The overall condition of this structure is poor. The existing 36-inch CMP is deteriorated and is fully submerged under normal flows. Structural damage to the CMP, headwall, and the approaches on Pelham Road have occurred due to past flooding events, and most recently, due to the fall 2005 and spring 2006 flooding of the area. Interim repairs were completed in the fall of 2006 including installation of road plates over the CMP and repaving Pelham Road.

Replacement of the existing 36-inch CMP is recommended for the Town to eliminate safety and access issues associated with the overtopping of Pelham Road. A 10-ft clear span, three sided box culvert with a natural bottom is recommended, in lieu of multi-cell box culverts. Such a structure would minimize blockage of the structure with debris and beaver dams. U-back wing walls are recommended for this site to minimize the project footprint. Although currently not a bridge structure, the replacement structure will be classified as a bridge and may be a candidate for replacement under the Municipally Managed Bridge Aid Program. Berger personnel are working with NHDOT on this issue. The area surrounding this culvert is also marshy and unlikely to possess archaeological sensitivity.

Based on the presentation of proposed improvements at each site, the character of the existing bridges and the surrounding built environment, the group concurred that there will likely be no adverse affect on historic or archaeological properties or resources at either site.

J. McKay outlined the information that Berger would be accountable for gathering and providing to NH DOT/NHDHR in order for them to make a final determination for these bridges:

- USGS Maps identifying project location for review by Edna Feighner of NHDHR for potential Historic or Native American resources.

Action Items:

- Mr. Gallant will provide additional mapping for review by NHDHR.
- Should the Cultural Resources Group confirm a no historic properties affected finding, Berger will follow through with the completion of a Cultural Resource Memorandum of Effect.

Exeter, X-A000(071), 13871. Participants: Jennifer Perry, City of Exeter, and Charlie Hood.

The Town of Exeter has a CMAC-funded project to expand the existing passenger railroad station parking area from 78 to 140 parking spaces. The expansion area is located along Lincoln Street. Currently, a 1982 metal building at 29 Garfield Street stands on the site, and it would be removed to complete the project. Examination of historic maps found that a freight house once stood at this location. It is believed that this building burned. Jennifer Perry indicated that the town had estimated about 21.5 inches of disturbance to create the parking lot. J. Perry offered to request from the Exeter Historical Society a historical photograph of the building.

Further discussion of the project occurred at the cultural resources meeting of February 8, 2007. The Exeter Historical Society provided a photograph, and it illustrated a substantial brick freight depot with railroad tracks going through each opposing ends of the building. The use of brick construction might have been an effort to fireproof the building. Archaeology would potentially address the manner of construction of the building and more importantly the use of the building. The primary question is why such a substantial building was erected to house freight activities. Did the building assist the adjacent brass foundry in accessing materials and shipping finished products? Depending on the depth of disturbance caused by the construction of the metal building, archaeological deposits may be able to address these questions and provide a better understanding of Exeter's railroad shipping center. It was concluded that the Exeter Historical Society might be willing to conduct some limited research on the building and its operation and its relationship to the brass foundry. DHR agreed to contact the historical society. C. Hood indicated that there might be only enough funding to purchase the metal building, and construction would occur at a later date.

Edna Feighner requested that the question of archaeological sensitivity initially be addressed by excavation of a backhoe trench adjacent to the standing building to examine the depth of disturbance and the nature of any archaeological deposits.

SAFETEA-LU Consultation Requirements. Participants: Leigh Levine, FHWA.

Section 6001 of SAFETEA-LU contains provisions for long-range transportation planning, certainly more than is required by current practice. This directive is less project specific, and focuses more on metropolitan areas and coordinates planning at the scale of the MPO's transportation needs. It would look at a scale similar to Bow-Concord and other CSS projects. Such planning is intended to include environmental and cultural resources issues. Thus, maps of these resources at a statewide or metropolitan level and the associated databases would be useful for this effort. Such broad-scale research would permit the comparison of cultural and other environmental resources to determine where conflicts arise with broad-scale transportation needs. Plans produced under this directive would include a discussion of the types of potential environmental mitigation as a policy statement developed in consultation with the regulatory agencies. This planning process would be used to refine purpose and need statements for projects. Other products would include regional development and growth analyses; local land use, growth management, and plan development; population and employment projections; GIS overlays showing the condition of the built and natural environments; identification of sensitive areas for resources; and projected land use. This planning effort does not extend NEPA requirements to transportation plans and programs.

Historic Bridge Survey. Participants: Nadine Peterson, Den Danna, Dave Powelson, and Mark Richardson.

FINAL LIST

Key: (1st number) indicates total number of that type
 (2nd number) indicates total that were built 1961 or later
 (Sample) Indicates that this category will be sampled rather than all bridges reviewed
 * Included in previous Bridge Survey

Bascule*	(2)
Beam Girder	(6) (1)
Concrete Arch*	(63) (7)
Concrete Rigid Frame*	(316) (112) (Sample)
Concrete Slab	(409) (48) (Sample)
Concrete Tee Beam*	(75) (5) (Sample)
Concrete Timber Composite*	(1)
Deck Plate Girder	(24) (2)
Deck Truss*	(5) (1)
High Truss*	(41) (3)
Lenticular	
Parker	
Petit	
Pratt	
Warren	
Combination trusses	
I-beams (all types)	(1380)(778)(Sample)
Jack Arch*	(37)
Low Truss*	(33) (15)
Parker	
Pratt	
Warren	
Masonry and Concrete Arch	(1)
Masonry Arch*	(56)
Masonry Slab*	(9)
Steel Arch*	(6)
Steel Rigid Frame	(3) (2)
Thru Plate Girder*	(36) (1)
Timber Bridge*	(66) (10)
Vertical Lift*	(2)

It was agreed that the above list was appropriate for the updated Historic Bridge Inventory.

N. Peterson noted that the 1980s survey looked at both municipal and state historic bridges. J. Garvin noted that without this level of sample, it would be difficult to understand the range of bridge types and the variation within the type across the state. If only state bridges were examined, the understanding of these issues would be artificially constrained. Examining the bridge types through the multiple property nomination format would permit examination of each bridge type within a context so that the significance of the type can be understood, the character features of each types can be delineated, and historical trends

affecting the construction of bridges and bridge designers and contractors can be identified and factored into the eligibility decision. While the evaluation of bridges would be completed in this larger context, the bridge preservation plan would focus on state-owned bridges.

Discussion then centered on which bridge type should be evaluated after the High Pratt Truss category. N. Peterson noted that Bridge Design provided a *Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Priority List* that identifies 124 State-owned bridges that will need to be either replaced or rehabbed over the next ten years. N. Peterson indicated that her review of the list showed that the majority of bridges on the list are IBC bridges. The second most-numerous category includes timber bridges. J. McKay noted her concern of trying to work with the IBC category, which may involve more than 600 bridges. All agreed that moving to the IBC category may be cumbersome and that the timber bridges would be a better option. J. Garvin did note that locating background materials for the Timber Bridge category might be difficult, but that it may still be worthwhile to evaluate the Timber Bridges after the High Pratt Trusses.

M. Richardson asked whether or not a tracking system could be set up to identify new bridges that employ revolutionary techniques, etc. as a stewardship process. N. Peterson indicated that this could probably be accomplished within the Access database being set up for the inventory update.

Programmatic Agreement. Participants: Bill Hauser and Dennis Danna.

Joyce McKay initiated discussion on the Programmatic Agreement to see if DHR had any concerns regarding the packet the NHDOT provided at the January 4, 2007 SHPO meeting. In general, DHR indicated that preparing a Programmatic Agreement was a good idea, but that detailed and long-term discussions as to its scope and content would need to take place. E. Feighner raised concerns about what types of projects could be exempt from review and asked if the existing MOU was still in effect. J. McKay noted that the existing MOU might not be a binding legal document, but that it was a good starting point for discussion. J. McKay will email a copy of the MOU to E. Feighner for her use. B. O'Donnell noted that the Programmatic Agreement process was used by FHWA successfully for other agencies implementing environmental laws and that FHWA would support the preparation of a Programmatic Agreement for cultural resources. B. O'Donnell also noted that the Programmatic Agreement could be implemented in a phased approach, if necessary. All those present agreed that drafting small sections of the Programmatic Agreement at the end of each SHPO meeting would be the best way to accomplish the preparation of such a document. (At the conclusion of the discussion, B. Hauser provided E. Feighner a copy of the existing MOU.)

Hillsborough Wal-Mart: Discussion of Transportation Alternatives. Participants: Rich Roach, ACOE; CR Willeke, District 4 NHDOT; and Joanna Lyons and Roy Duddy, DRED.

CR Willeke discussed different traffic control options at the intersection of NH Route 9 and 31 and at the access to Main Street on Route 9. Originally, the NHDOT established controlled access along the NH Route 9 By-Pass. However, in this instance, some

modification may now be possible by for example placing a roundabout at the intersection of NH Routes 9 and 31 or placing one near the end of West Main Street. The currently conceived single lane roundabout at Routes 9 and 31 would have a diameter of 130' and fit into the existing NHDOT right-of-way. It might require some sliver-takes. If the intersection of Route 9 and 31 were chosen for the roundabout, an access road might be built between the south leg of the intersection from the Second NH Turnpike to West Main Street.

Linda Wilson wondered how this design would affect traffic on the Second New Hampshire Turnpike. The impact including noise, air quality, and light by the roundabout as opposed to the currently proposed median on the Second New Hampshire Turnpike would be similar. L. Wilson's concern was primarily for the purchase of developable land at the intersection by private parties and wondered if DOT could limit access to the immediate area of the intersection.

It was noted that these options would be presented to the parties attending the meeting the next day in Hillsborough.

February 8, 2007

Programmatic Agreement. Participants: Nadine Peterson, Joyce McKay, Bill Hauser, and Den Danna.

The following information was presented for discussion in order to better define what type of project should be covered under the agreement.

Type 1 projects are classified as rehabilitation or reconstruction projects that have limited APE's and are unlikely to involve significant cultural resource concerns. To qualify as a Type 1 project, an undertaking must not be part of a larger undertaking, must be along an existing transportation facility, must be classified as a "categorical exclusion", and must have no known public controversy based on cultural resource issues. Furthermore, to be considered Type 1, projects must occur within existing rights-of-way of transportation systems, or on DOT properties such as district offices, rest areas, weigh stations, surplus lands, wetland mitigation sites, railroad corridors and conservation lands.

The following activities, should they involve minimal new rights-of-way (fee or easement) may also be considered Type 1:

Rehabilitation or replacement of bridges and culverts on existing alignment, when the project involves bridges less than 50 years old, or non-eligible bridges as determined in the New Hampshire Historic Bridge Inventory Update.

Resurfacing, restoration, or rehabilitation activities, including widening less than one lane, shoulder additions to roadways, slope restoration/reconstruction, bridge approaches, turn lanes within the existing roadbed (including existing shoulders), intersection improvements, guardrail installation or replacement, minor changes in alignment where the new centerline is within the existing right-of-way, or new drainage for an existing roadway.

Purchase or disposal of lands for wetland mitigation sites, provided that they are associated with projects covered under this agreement.

Construction of sidewalks, curbing, and lighting improvements.

Construction of bicycle and pedestrian lanes, paths and facilities, and multi-use paths and facilities,

Emergency repairs, including necessary work to restore essential travel, typically within 45 days of the event.

Installation of noise barriers or alterations to existing publicly owned buildings to provide for noise reduction.

Acquisition of scenic easements.

Construction of recreational trails funded under the National Recreational Trails Funding Program.

Transportation Enhancement Activities.

J. McKay requested a response from others as to whether or not this approach was viable. All agreed that something similar to the above, with possible minor revisions, was an acceptable approach. J. McKay requested that a NHDHR staff person be designated as a liaison for the Programmatic Agreement process, particularly E. Feighner. Linda concurred that E. Feighner would be a good choice, since she is responsible for Section 106 compliance at NHDHR. E. Feighner was not in attendance to confirm her availability. It was concluded that a draft version of the first section of the Programmatic Agreement should be prepared as a talking point at one of the March 2007 meetings. NHDOT staff will prepare the draft document for review. L. Wilson thought that the reference to the Transportation Enhancement Activities should be deleted since some of these projects can be quite large.

Kingston, SP-S4515 (surplus property). Participant: Christine Perron.

The surplus land includes two contiguous parcels east of NH Route 125, 2000 feet south of the New Boston Road and ca. 300 feet east of the Powwow River. Because of its location and topography, E. Feighner determined that this site would be archaeologically sensitive. Therefore, any potential buyers will be required to have a combined Phase 1A/1B archaeological survey completed prior to the purchase of the parcel. If this survey finds archaeological deposits, then further testing would be required to determine significance (Phase II survey) if the area could not be avoided. If significant and the site area was required for development, then the site would require data recovery.

Conway, HP-STP-NHS-DPI-MGS-TX (001), 11339. Participants: Phil Miles, Don Lyford, and Sandy and James Logan, bidder, Deerfield.

Phil Miles introduced Sandy and James Logan who had submitted a bid to purchase the National Register-eligible barn now on .5 acres in Conway. Some of the character-defining features were discussed with J. Garvin. They include its balloon frame construction, its tongue and groove interior finishes, and its exterior finishes including its clapboards, shingling, window treatments, and cupola, which would be important to preserve during the building's rehabilitation to the purposed residential use. The Logans indicated that they would likely insulate the barn with blown-in insulation. Sewer and water would need to be added. They indicated that more windows would need to be added. J. Garvin noted that the exterior rehabilitation would need to follow the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, and as much of the significant interior finishes as possible should be preserved.

NHDHR requested design review at about 80% completion. J. Garvin indicated that he would send a list of architects who typically complete design for the rehabilitation of historic buildings. Phil Miles indicated that the water district was to remove its materials, but at this point he was not sure which items it had brought to the barn. J. McKay agreed to modify the easement to permit rehabilitation of the barn for residential use. L. Wilson will review the revisions. The revised easement will be sent to sandy_logan@hotmail.com.

Warren, X-A000(526), 13209. Participants: Don Lyford and Charles Hood.

The meeting was intended to discuss the request of FHWA by Eric Jones to be a consulting party to the Section 106 process.

The development of the Warren project began in 2001. At the public meeting in November of that year, Eric Jones requested to become a consulting party. On February 2, 2002, the Department signed a No Historic Properties Affected Memo. And, on April 2, 2002, this memo was altered to a No Adverse Effect Memo. The hearing occurred on May 2, 2002. This plan showed the design in the Village of Glencliff as 11-foot lanes and four-foot shoulders. After the hearing, this design was modified to reflect the public sentiment to 24 feet of pavement in the village. No right-of-way will be purchased in the village. Originally, betterment money funded the project, and a permit would have been received from the Army Corps. FHWA funding was not programmed into the project until later in the design process. Another information meeting was held on October 6, 2006. Incorrect plans at that meeting showed more than 24' of pavement. This oversight was discussed with Eric Jones after the meeting; and the intent to build a project with 24' of pavement was confirmed.

It was noted that the project was beyond the consulting party stage. The currently defined project of 24' of pavement meets the requested improvement within the Village of Glencliff. It was agreed that the necessary consultation did occur at the October 6, 2006 meeting. Linda Wilson indicated that the NHDOT had constructively met the consultation requirements and that it was not necessary to open the consulting party process at this late date. She emphasized that there should not be changes in design from the 24' wide pavement in the Village of Glencliff. If any alterations to the project from this design should occur within the village, it would be brought to the attention of NHDHR. Her main concern lay with impacts in the village area.

Don Lyford indicated that he would rough out a letter for the Bureau of Environment to send to Eric Jones confirming this design for the Bureau and that the Bureau will send it.

Nashua 11057. Participant: Joyce McKay.

J. McKay discussed the hazardous material sampling at the Rotary Commons Park Site, which contains industrial archaeological remains. E. Feighner indicated that single sampling units no larger than 4" cores should not disturb archaeological deposits as long as they avoided structural remains. J. McKay agreed to be on site during the sampling.

Berlin, X-A000(055), 13845: Scenic By-Ways Grant: Brown Company Research and Development Building. Participants: Jim Garvin and Carol Barleon, Office of Planning and Energy Programming.

This project involves the Northern Forest Heritage Park and was initiated in 2001 with partial funding from a Scenic Byways grant. NHDHR found that this building is eligible for the National Register at the national level. It had been assumed that some portion of the building would require demolition because of contamination issues. It has been found that the contamination is not as pervasive as originally thought.

The Northern Forest Heritage Park, which currently does not have a director, holds the contract with Scenic Byways. The city has been providing some assistance. It was noted that the contract would need an extension. C. Barleon would need to petition FHWA for the extension and amend the scope of work in the grant application. Such a change is feasible as long as the ultimate goal of the funds, to complete a feasibility study to create an interpretive center, remains in place. The organization intends to re-engage Proven and Lorber to examine the structural stability of the building to determine what parts of the building can be retained and to produce a work plan.

The HAER documentation needs to be completed using these funds, hence the requested change in the use of funds. Because a portion of the building needs to be removed, the effect is adverse. The documentation needs to be completed while the weather remains cold because of the mold contamination.

Portsmouth, BRF-X-0182(066), 10665. Participant: Bill Barry (wbarry@vhb.com).

Bill Barry gave a status report on the project and provided a handout summarizing the impacts to the NR eligible properties. Of the four eligible properties, only two (the Two Mile/Hayes Railroad Bridge and Sherburne House property) will be impacted. There is a remote chance that the Helen Diamond House at 653 Greenland Rd. could be affected if the underground drainage across the property needs to be replaced. None of the slope work associated with the roadway improvements touches this property, however.

Linda Greer, VHB, showed plan views of the roadway design indicating there would be a very minor impact on the Sherburne House property along Islington St. due to slope work

and on another portion of the property along Greenland Road due to a new sidewalk. Greg Goodrich, VHB, also reviewed the design of the new bridge and reiterated that the maintenance of traffic had necessitated the more southerly alignment of the new bridge.

Impacts to the Two Mile Bridge will be considered an “Adverse Effect,” while those to the Sherburne House Property will be considered “No Adverse Effect.” VHB will draft the “Effects Memo” for the committee’s review.

Mitigation for the railroad bridge will include large format photo documentation of the existing bridge including its deck and abutments with photo key and map showing views as well as a general location map and HAER cover sheet. The narrative provides the historical background, contextual information about the rail line, a detailed description of the bridge, and a comparative study with other bridges of a similar type on the line. They asked that Rita Walsh, VHB’s architectural historian, meet with them to discuss the format of the report. Bill said he would have Rita call Joyce to be put on the schedule for a future Cultural Resources meeting. A plaque or similar historic marker could also be installed on the new bridge.

Bill stated that Kathy Wheeler had completed her Phase 1B testing at the western edge of Plains Park and along the north edge of Calvary Cemetery, a possible location of the former Globe Tavern. Her end-of-field report stated that she had found no evidence of structures or intact archaeological deposits. Kathy is recommending that no additional archaeological survey work is necessary.

A brief discussion of the Section 4(f) issues took place. Plains Park is considered 4(f) because it is a recreational resource, while the Sherburne House and railroad bridge are 4(f) because of their NR eligibility. It was pointed out that additional archaeological work may be necessary for any ground disturbance associated with improvements at the eastern end of Plains Park. In addition, the WWI markers at the western end will need to be relocated as part of the project’s landscaping plan.

This project will ultimately require a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) among FHWA, NHDOT, DHR and probably the City of Portsmouth describing the impacts on eligible historic resources and providing for the mitigation of those impacts.

Laconia, X-A000(349), 14409. Participant: Jay Poulin, HEB (jpoulin@hebcivil.com) and Steve Smith and Alan Beetle, Laconia Trails with Rails Exploratory Committee (LTREC).

HE Bergeron is undertaking the feasibility study of the WOW trail in Laconia. It is a Phase I of the Rail to Trail Project between Belmont and Meredith. Most sections of the path are in the rail corridor, which is owned by the state and leased to the HOBO Railroad out of Lincoln. It was noted that the sewer follows the rail corridor. There are some sections of the trail that the city would like to place away from the corridor along the lake. E. Feighner noted that this area is sensitive for archaeological sites and that rail beds can go over archaeological sites. She requested that the town complete a phase IA investigation along the whole trail including those parts along the rail bed. This survey should determine whether the trail is over the sewer line to verify disturbance. The investigation should include core samples to determine the level of disturbance.

Jay Poulin stated that this meeting was intended to be a conceptual overview of Phase I of the WOW Trail and identify any concerns early in the process. The project involves the design and construction of a shared use path for bicycles and pedestrians through the City of Laconia. This is primarily a rail with trail project following the Plymouth and Lincoln Railroad in Laconia.

Jay Poulin noted the railroad corridor is owned by State of New Hampshire. The only operating rail service on the Laconia segment is the Hobo Railroad of Lincoln which is a slow-speed seasonal train service. The project is a joint venture between the Laconia Trails with Rails Exploratory Committee (LTREC) and the City of Laconia. There is a municipal agreement in-place between the City & State for shared-use of the corridor.

A preliminary feasibility analysis for the pathway was completed by Alta Planning & Design, which was released in a report in 2003. Steve Smith Associates completed the base mapping. The pathway, when complete, will be approximately 9 miles in length and run from the Belmont Town Line to the Meredith Town Line. Phase 1 includes the area from Main St. to Elm Street in Laconia. Total path length for Phase 1 is approx. 7,400'. Of that length, approximately 2000' follows Messer Street. The feasibility analysis includes the pathway following the railroad corridor for all portions of Phase I except for Messer Street. Construction is anticipated to be a paved pathway 10' wide with 2' shoulders whenever along the railroad corridor. The design parameters of the pathway along Messer Street are currently undetermined.

J. Poulin then noted that there are a couple of opportunities for the pathway to be located outside the railroad corridor in order to enhance the experience while utilizing the pathway. Edna Feighner commented that this project is located in archeologically sensitive areas and, at a minimum, a Phase IA visual assessment must be done for the proposed pathway, even in the railroad corridor. J. Poulin then identified areas where existing sewer line is within railroad corridor. E. Feighner replied that if construction occurs within an existing disturbance, then it is likely that no archaeological investigation is needed for that area. It was then noted that the Moulton St. extension, which was constructed approximately 3 years ago, might have had a previous archaeological investigation for that project. No other concerns, besides archaeological, were noted during the meeting.

J. Poulin noted that once a final alignment is selected for the pathway and a Phase IA archaeological investigation is completed that HEB would return to review the final design.

Hinsdale, X-A000(426), 14540N. Participant: Jon Evans.

The project involves the reconstruction of NH Route 63 that was damaged during the floods of October 9, 2005. Floodwaters in adjacent Kilburn Brook undermined the roadway, causing the collapse of a large section of northbound travel lane and portions of the southbound lane. In order to restore safe passage through this area, a temporary bypass road was constructed immediately following the flood event. The temporary bypass road was erected approximately 20 feet to the west of the former alignment of NH Route 63. The new temporary alignment shifted the roadway outside of the existing Right-of-Way, directly adjacent to an existing private structure (Smith/Jeffords property), which is eligible for the National Register and a contributing property to the Hinsdale Village District Area.

Given the existing space limitations, acquisition of this property is necessary to safely reconstruct NH Route 63.

J. McKay began by noting that under normal circumstances the Department would be required to mitigate for acquisition of this property in part by advertising the existing structures for sale. The existing structure has been found to contain large amounts of asbestos, which include materials ACM. Should the house be advertised for sale, the Department would not remove the ACM and would sell "as is." This would make it unlikely that there would be any bidders.

Advertising the structure for sale would require several additional months before removal could begin. The current system of alternating one-way traffic is substandard and therefore unsafe. Advertising the structure for sale would require the road to remain in its current, unsafe condition for a longer period of time.

L. Wilson noted that given how tight this section of roadway is, it appears that it may not even be feasible or safe to move the structure. She also noted that the exterior of the house has been substantially altered. However, the house appears to have originally been a cape. She felt that the documentation of the structure, as previously agreed, would be adequate mitigation for the proposed impacts to this property. It was also noted that the boundaries of the Hinsdale Village District Area will be included as part of the mitigation.

It was agreed by all that upon documentation, the building could be removed without advertising the structure for sale.

Goffstown Culvert (FEMA). Participants: Meghan Theriault, Carl Quiram, and Michael Hillhouse, Town of Goffstown.

A granite box culvert beneath the Town's Rail Trail and old trolley line was severely damaged during the May 2006 floods. The box culvert is approximately 113' long by 3-6" wide by 8' high.

There are two distinct sections in the box culvert. The first section of the granite box culvert was built around 1850 for the New Hampshire Central Railroad. This section appears to be comprised of granite block walls and granite slabs on top. The culvert which runs beneath the rail bed to the outlet in Glen Lake was rehabbed at some point by lining the granite walls and floor with concrete (up to 4 feet high on the sides). The second section of the granite box culvert was added on in 1905 for a trolley line. This section appears to have a granite slab top, mortar and rubble walls, and an earthen bottom. This section of the culvert suffered significant damage during the May 2006 floods. Scouring occurred on the east side of the structure to a depth of 2 feet below the wall. This scouring allowed material from the outside of the wall to wash through the culvert and eventually caused a complete collapse in the slope on the east side. There were also large cracks that occurred in the mortar between the stones and even some of the large stones were cracked.

NHDHR noted that immediately after the floods, all culverts were declared potentially eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, pending additional study. After reviewing photographs and discussing the existing condition of the section of the culvert located along the Trolley line, it was concluded that this culvert had lost integrity and may not be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. However, this finding would require confirmation after examining files maintained by NHDHR.

The Goffstown Department of Public Works is requesting that the ca. 1905 section of the culvert be removed rather than rehabilitated. It is the Department of Public Works' opinion that repair of the structure would be costly and time consuming and there is a possibility that it will fail again in the future. If the section of the box culvert is removed from the inlet to the Rail Trail, the Department of Public Works proposes to build stone headwalls along the new inlet to prevent future scouring and reestablish the slope in that area. J. Garvin noted that using any salvageable stone from the culvert in the construction of the headwall would be a benefit, but indicated that NHDHR needed to review its correspondence prior to making any findings about this project.

Actions: E. Feighner will review the original FEMA letters of correspondence regarding stone culverts in flood-damaged areas to confirm that there are no additional commitments that need to be followed. A "No Historic Properties Affected" Form will be prepared by the Town of Goffstown, Department of Public Works for signature by DHR if the current course of action is consistent with the review of FEMA correspondence. J. McKay will email a copy of the form to Meghan Theriault, Goffstown Department of Public Works, for her use.

Subsequent Findings by J. Garvin, NHDHR on 2/14/07: In reviewing this project in the fall of 2006, the Division of Historical Resources was working on the assumption that all stone culverts were NR eligible until we had a means to demonstrate otherwise. We had consensus that this particular culvert was to be treated as eligible, and we proceeded on that basis.

I don't believe that FEMA ever told us their exact rationale for making the determination that they did, but that determination was that the culvert should be REPAIRED, not REPLACED. If the culvert were not to be repaired, we would never require that it be replaced unless it was essential for the functioning of the rail trail.

FEMA's recommendation for treatment under PW 921 was "remove the debris, repoint the culvert, stabilize the settlement, and replace the lost embankment." This was to be accomplished through 89 cubic yards of excavation, 889 cubic yards of backfilling, and 4 cubic yards of structural concrete below the undermined culvert wall.

Based on this proposal, State Historic Preservation Officer James McConaha signed a "No Adverse Effect" letter on September 20, 2006.

We had not reconstructed our file on this review as of last Thursday when the Goffstown delegation brought the project to our cultural resources meeting. Thus, while we agreed to consider demolition of the culvert, we said we needed time to review our files and to consider the question of loss of integrity of the culvert.

Now that we have reviewed our files and learned that we had proceeded to a finding of "No Adverse Effect" based on the proposal to repair the culvert, we will need to return to the original proposal for repair, and the original finding of "No Adverse Effect," and re-start the review from that point unless we stay with the agreed-upon repair.

If we do determine that the culvert has lost National Register integrity due to structural damage, then we can proceed on that basis. If we find that the culvert retains integrity and is still NR-eligible, then we will have an "Adverse Effect" if demolition is pursued as an option. In such a case, we will have to define appropriate mitigation for the adverse effect,

probably some form[s] of recordation, and draft and sign a Memorandum of Agreement memorializing our agreed-upon mitigation. No work should occur on the culvert until we have completed this procedure.

****Memos:** None.

Submitted by Joyce McKay, Cultural Resources Manager

S:\MEETINGS\SHPO\07minutes\2-1-8.doc